KELLOGG, HUBER, HANSEN, TODD, EVANS & FIGEL, P.L.LC.

SUMNER SQUARE 1615 M STREET, N W.

SUITE 400

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036-3209

(202) 326-7900

FACSIMILE: (202) 326-7999

January 8, 2009

FILED/ACCEPTED

JAN -8 2009

Federal Communications Commission Office of the Secretary

Via Hand Delivery

Marlene H. Dortch Secretary Federal Communications Commission 445 12th Street, SW Room TW-A325 Washington, DC 20554

Re: In the Matter of TCR Sports Broadcasting Holding, L.L.P. d/b/a Mid-Atlantic

Sports Network, et al., MB Docket No. 08-214

Dear Ms. Dortch:

Please find enclosed the original and four copies of Response of Complainant TCR Sports Broadcasting Holding, L.L.P. d/b/a Mid-Atlantic Sports Network to Defendants' Supplemental Notice to be filed in the above-captioned docket.

Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions.

Respectfully submitted,

20 Cheduik

David C. Frederick

Enclosures

No. of Copies rec'd OYYList ABCDE

BEFORE THE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSIC WASHINGTON, D.C. 20554

ORIGINAL

In the Matters of) MB Docket No. 08-214	
Herring Broadcasting, Inc. d/b/a WealthTV, Complainant v.) File No. CSR-7709-P	
Time Warner Cable Inc. Defendant)))	
Herring Broadcasting, Inc. d/b/a WealthTV, Complainant) File No. CSR-7822-P	FILED/ACCEPTED
v. Bright House Networks, LLC, Defendant)))	JAN - 8 2009 Federal Communications Commission Office of the Secretary
Herring Broadcasting, Inc. d/b/a WealthTV, Complainant v.) File No. CSR-7829-P)	
Cox Communications, Inc., Defendant)))	
Herring Broadcasting, Inc. d/b/a WealthTV, Complainant v.) File No. CSR-7907-P	
Comcast Corporation, Defendant	,))	
TCR Sports Broadcasting Holding, L.L.P., d/b/a Mid-Atlantic Sports Network, Complaint) File No. CSR-8001-P))	
Comcast Corporation, Defendant	,))	

To: The Commission

RESPONSE OF COMPLAINANT TCR SPORTS BROADCASTING HOLDING, L.L.P. D/B/A MID-ATLANTIC SPORTS NETWORK TO DEFENDANTS' SUPPLEMENTAL NOTICE

TCR Sports Broadcasting Holding, L.L.P, doing business as Mid-Atlantic Sports

Network ("MASN"), hereby files this response to the Supplemental Notice in Support of

Emergency Motion for Stay and Emergency Application for Review filed on January 7, 2009 by

Defendants Comcast Corporation, Time Warner Cable Inc., Cox Communications, Inc., and

Bright House Networks, LLC (collectively, "Defendants"). In the Supplemental Notice,

Defendants inform the Commission (at 2) that Chief ALJ Sippel has "continue[d] to assert

jurisdiction over these proceedings" based on a January 6, 2009 order in which the ALJ claimed
that his previous scheduling order "deserve[d] compliance." Defendants argue (at 4) that this

ultra vires assertion of authority "present[s] the strongest possible case for an immediate stay" of
the Media Bureau's Jurisdiction Order, which held that the ALJ's authority over these matters
had expired.²

Defendants are wrong for multiple reasons. First, Defendants fail to inform the Commission that it was *Defendants* that urged the ALJ to commit legal error by inviting him to treat the Media Bureau's *Jurisdiction Order* as a "nullity." Separate Statement of Bright House Networks, LLC in Support of Motion for Reaffirmation of Scheduling Order at 2 (filed Dec. 31, 2008); *see* Motion for Reaffirmation of Scheduling Order or, In the Alternative, Request for Certification of an Application for Review (filed Dec. 30, 2008). Despite having filed an Emergency Application for Review and Motion for Stay with this Commission – typically the proper means for reviewing a bureau decision (although, here, the Application seeks improper

¹ Order, FCC 09M-01 (ALJ rel. Jan. 6, 2009).

² Memorandum Opinion and Order, DA 08-2805 (MB rel. Dec. 24, 2008) ("Jurisdiction Order").

interlocutory review) – Defendants took the extraordinary step of encouraging Chief ALJ Sippel to defy the terms of the *Jurisdiction Order* and to assert continuing authority over these proceedings, just as Defendants had urged the ALJ to commit error by disregarding the mandatory deadline in the *HDO*.³ Having encouraged the ALJ to assert authority over these cases and thereby creating what Defendants themselves call (at 3) the "administrative spectacle" of a subordinate official pushing forward with a proceeding that a bureau of this Commission has declared expired, Defendants' reliance on this "spectacle" as a basis for staying the *Bureau's* order is astonishing.

Second, and independently, Defendants are wrong (at 3) that a risk of "parallel, conflicting" proceedings is a basis for staying the *Jurisdiction Order*. To begin with, in response to Chief ALJ Sippel's order, MASN (as well as WealthTV), as a courtesy, filed a status report on January 7, 2009 stating that the *Jurisdiction Order* conclusively held that proceedings before the ALJ had expired. *See* Joint Status Report of TCR Sports Broadcasting, L.L.P. d/b/a Mid-Atlantic Sports Network and Herring Broadcasting, Inc. d/b/a WealthTV (filed Jan. 7, 2009). MASN further explained that the Bureau's determination is binding on the parties, as well as the ALJ, and that the ALJ does not sit in review of a decision of a bureau of this Commission. MASN and WealthTV thus made clear that they would not participate in any further proceedings

³ As MASN explained in its Joint Opposition to Emergency Application for Review (filed Jan. 6, 2009) and Joint Opposition to Motion for Stay (filed Jan. 6, 2009), the Bureau's conclusion in the *Jurisdiction Order* that the ALJ's delegated authority had expired is well-supported. *See* Memorandum Opinion and Order, DA 08-2269, ¶ 124 (MB rel. Oct. 10, 2008), as modified by *erratum* adopted and released October 15, 2008 ("*HDO*") (imposing mandatory deadline on issuance of a recommended decision by the ALJ).

before the ALJ unless and until directed to do so by this Commission. The prospect of parallel and conflicting proceedings involving MASN and WealthTV is therefore extremely remote.⁴

Furthermore, the risk of "parallel" and "conflicting" proceedings supports promptly rejecting, not granting, Defendants' Motion for Stay. Were this Commission to grant Defendants' Motion for Stay in these circumstances, it would sanction Defendants' end-run around the appropriate review process for bureau decisions and Defendants' efforts to draw into conflict various arms of this Commission. It would also sanction the ALJ's express defiance of two orders of this Commission's bureaus. The Commission has an obvious institutional interest in avoiding rewarding or condoning such conduct. Instead, the Commission can and should address the risk of parallel and conflicting proceedings by promptly denying Defendants' Motion for Stay (as well as Defendants' Application for Review), sending the unequivocal message to all parties that this Commission will not condone its administrative hearing officials openly disregarding the mandates of this Commission's bureaus when acting under the delegated authority of the Commission. See 5 U.S.C. § 556(c); 47 U.S.C. § 155(c).

⁴ Defendants suggest in their Supplemental Notice (at 3) that the *Jurisdiction Order* has not "go[ne] into effect." They offer no support for this bald assertion, which is understandable because it is wrong. *See* 47 U.S.C. § 155(c)(3) (a bureau order has the force and effect of law unless this Commission's grants an application for review of that order). Defendants' abandonment of discovery schedules in the wake of the *Jurisdiction Order* and their prompt filing of a Motion for Stay of that order demonstrate that Defendants themselves understand the *Jurisdiction Order* has "go[ne] into effect."

Respectfully submitted,

David C. Frederick

Evan T. Leo

Kelly P. Dunbar

David F. Engstrom

Kellogg, Huber, Hansen, Todd,

Evans & Figel, P.L.L.C.

1615 M Street N.W., Suite 400

Washington, D.C. 20036

(202) 326-7900

January 8, 2009

Attorneys for TCR Sports Broadcasting Holding, L.L.P.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, David C. Frederick, hereby certify that, on January 8, 2009, copies of the foregoing

document were served as follows:

Via Hand Delivery and Electronic Mail

Monica Desai (monica.desai@fcc.gov) Chief, Media Bureau Federal Communications Commission 445 12th Street, SW Washington, D.C. 20554

The Honorable Richard L. Sippel (richard.sippel@fcc.gov)
Chief Administrative Law Judge
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, SW
Washington, D.C. 20554

Kris Anne Monteith (kris.monteith@fcc.gov)
Gary P. Schonmann (gary.schonman@fcc.gov)
Elizabeth Mumaw (elizabeth.mumaw@fcc.gov)
Enforcement Bureau
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, SW
Washington, D.C. 20554

Matthew Berry (matthew.berry@fcc.gov) General Counsel Federal Communications Commission 445 12th Street, SW Washington, D.C. 20554

The Honorable Arthur L. Steinberg (arthur.steinberg@fcc.gov) Administrative Law Judge Federal Communications Commission 445 12th Street, SW Washington, D.C. 20554

Via First-Class and Electronic Mail

Jonathan D. Blake (jblake@cov.com)
Gregg H. Levy (glevy@cov.com)
James M. Garland (jgarland@cov.com)
Sarah L. Wilson (swilson@cov.com)
Robert M. Sherman (rsherman@cov.com)
Covington & Burling LLP
1201 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, D.C. 20004

Jay Cohen (jaycohen@paulweiss.com)
Henk Brands (hbrands@paulweiss.com)
Samuel E. Bonderoff
(sbonderoff@paulweiss.com)
Paul Weiss Rifkind Wharton & Garrison LLP
1285 Avenue of the Americas
New York, NY 10011

J. Christopher Redding
(credding@dowlohnes.com)
David E. Mills (dmills@dowlohnes.com)
Jason E. Rademacher
(jrademacher@dowlohnes.com)
Dow Lohnes PLLC
1200 New Hampshire Avenue, NW, Suite 800
Washington, D.C. 20036

Arthur H. Harding (aharding@fh-law.com)
Seth A. Davidson (sdavidson@fh-law.com)
Micah M. Caldwell (mcaldwell@fh-law.com)
Fleischman and Harding LLP
1255 23rd Street, NW, 8th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20037

Arthur J. Steinhauser (asteinhauer@sbandg.com) Cody Harrison (charrison@sbandg.com) Sabin Bermant & Gould LLP Four Times Square New York, NY 10036

James L. Casserly (jcasserly@willkie.com)
Michael H. Hammer (mhammer@willkie.com)
Willkie Farr & Gallagher LLP
1875 K Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20006

Michael P. Carroll (michael.carroll@dpw.com)
David B. Toscano (david.toscano@dpw.com)
Davis Polk & Wardwell
450 Lexington Avenue
New York, NY 10017

Geoffrey M. Klineberg (gklineberg@khhte.com)
Priya R. Aiyar (paiyar@khhte.com)
Derek T. Ho (dho@khhte.com)
Kellogg, Huber, Hansen, Todd,
Evans & Figel, P.L.L.C.
1615 M Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

R. Bruce Beckner (bbeckner@fh-law.com)
Mark B. Denbo (mdenbo@fh-law.com)
Rebecca E. Jacobs (rjacobs@fh-law.com)
Fleishman and Harding LLP
1255 23rd Street, NW, 8th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20037

David H. Solomon (dsolomon@wbklaw.com)
L. Andrew Tollin (atollin@wbklaw.com)
Wilkinson Barker Knauer, LLP
2300 N Street, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20037

Kathleen Wallman (wallmank@wallman.com) Kathleen Wallman, PLLC 9332 Ramey Lane Great Falls, VA 22066

David C. Frederick